

we want to have a permanent normal trade relationship with them to help them build up their technological capabilities.

Such immoral policy-making will come back and hurt the United States. This is Neville Chamberlain's strategy with Adolph Hitler, build up his economy that he will not dare to commit aggression.

We will be hurt very badly if we pass this. Oppose PNTR.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a quote of President Chen Shui-bian, the newly inaugurated President of Taiwan: "We would welcome the normalization of U.S.-China trade relations, just like we hope the Cross Strait relations between Taiwan and China can also be normalized. We look forward to both the People's Republic of China's and Taiwan's accession to the WTO."

The next quote is from the EU Trade Commissioner Pascal Lamy, who said, "WTO entry has benefits for China, as it has benefits for EU companies, and it will enhance EU-China relations and that has just been concluded."

And finally, "American businesses and religious leaders need to remain engaged in China as an example and as a voice for our values. Rejecting the constructive bilateral trade agreements offered by the Chinese and denying normal trade relations would mean severing ties that would take generations to repair."

I would remind colleagues, this may be the most critically important vote they will cast in their entire career in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, American business men and women have eyed China for years, knowing that the sky is the limit when it comes to selling American made goods and services to the world's largest market. But Americans have found it difficult to trade with China since complete access to this vast market has been restricted.

In today's global market, we can no longer afford any restrictions on trade with the world's largest population. We must engage China, and ensure that American companies and American workers have the tools to compete with other nations in Chinese markets. Remember, when America competes, we win. That's why I voted for a permanent trading relationship between the United States and China.

In fact, over the past year I have taken an active role in promoting America's free trade with China. Specifically, in Washington, as a member of the House Leadership's China Trade Team, I have worked with House Rules Chairman DAVID DREIER and my colleagues in support of extending permanent normal trade relations, PNTR, with China.

Back at home, I have met with hundreds of people in New Jersey's business community to encourage them to organize and help spread the word about the benefits increased trade with China will bring home to the Garden State. In fact, Chairman DREIER and I assembled a group of New Jersey's business lead-

ers in April to "rally the troops," so to speak. Joined by the CEO of Honeywell, Michael Bonsignore, we articulated five main points that are deciding factors in my support of trade with China.

First, extending permanent normal trading relations with China is a win for fairness—this agreement forces China to adhere to our rules-based trading system. Without an agreement, there are no rules, and we have no say whatsoever in how China conducts its business with the rest of the world.

Second, it's a win for U.S. workers and businesses—China is an incredibly important emerging market with more than a billion consumers. America's world class businesses, large and small—manufacturers, high tech/biotech companies, entertainers, farmers, financial institutions—know that being shut out of China, especially as China opens its doors to the rest of the world, is a very big mistake.

Third, trade with China is a win for American values inside China—through free and fair trade, America will not only export many products and services, but we will deliver a good old fashioned dose of our democratic values and free-market ideas. These ideals are already percolating in China—interestingly, today there are more Chinese shareholders in private companies in China than there are members of the Chinese Communist Party!

Fourth, international trade, whether with China or any other nation, means jobs for New Jerseyans, and continued prosperity for our state. That's the bottom line. Out of New Jersey's 4.1 million-member workforce, almost 600,000 people statewide—from Main Street to Fortune 500 companies—are employed because of exports, imports and foreign direct investment.

China ranked as New Jersey's 9th largest export destination in 1998, an increase from 13th in 1993. Our Garden State exported \$668 million in merchandise to China in 1998, more than double what was exported five years earlier. With a formal trade agreement in place, imagine the potential as access to China's vast market is improved! Enormous opportunities exist for New Jersey's telecommunications, environmental technology, healthcare, agriculture and food processing industries.

Fifth and finally, in the interests of world peace, it is absolutely a mistake to isolate China, a nation with the world's largest standing army, an estimated 2.6 million-member force. America's democratic allies in Asia support China's entry into the World Trade Organization because they know that a constructive relationship with China in a stable Asia offers the best chance for reducing regional tensions along the Taiwan Strait, and for avoiding a new arms race elsewhere in Asia.

I am fully aware of the controversy surrounding my vote. Indeed, humanitarian and environmental issues remain important to me in our dealings with China. But I refuse to believe that if we walk away from China our national interests would be better served. In fact, I am positive to do so would deter from our ability, and our credibility, to push reform in China and around the globe.

As General Colin Powell said, "From every standpoint—from a strategic standpoint, from the standpoint of our national interests, from the standpoint of our trading interests and our economic interests—it serves all of our purposes to grant permanent normal trading relations with China."

My vote ensures we give American workers the tools to compete with the world, and win. Moreover, by extending a permanent trading relationship with China, we ensure that China adheres to our rules in the global marketplace, and that along with our goods and services, we export American values and democratic ideals.

□ 1900

The CHAIRMAN. All time allotted for general debate has expired.

Under the order of the House of today, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4444) to authorize extension of non-discriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. VELAZQUEZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NETHERCUTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ETHERIDGE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IRANIAN JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to firmly state my outrage at the behavior of the government of Iran regarding the thirteen members of the Iranian Jewish community who are currently incarcerated by Iranian authorities. It is a moral outrage, innocent people are being held against their will just because of their religion.

Iran has a terrible record of human rights violations. According to the State Department and several internationally recognized human rights organizations such as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, religious minorities in the Islamic Republic of Iran have been the victims of human rights violations solely because of their status as religious minorities. These include Sunni Muslims, Christians, and Jews.

More specifically, the Iranian Jewish community has been in especially terrible danger. In just the past five years, the Iranian government without having been tried has executed five Jews. There has been a noticeable increase recently in anti-Semitic propaganda in the government-controlled Iranian press, and many Jews have been forced to flee the country.

Most recently, as I have mentioned, Iranian authorities arrested thirteen Jews, including community and religious leaders in the city of Shiraz. Iran has charged these Jews with espionage on behalf of the United States and Israel, and has pursued their executions. They have been denied visitation privileges during their months of detainment and their fate looks increasingly perilous as time passes.

These Jews, including rabbis, religious teachers and community activists, have committed no such crime. The United States and Israel have adamantly denied any connection to these prisoners.

All the Jews of Iran want is to be able to live in their country, where they have thousands of

years of history, while fulfilling their Jewish identities. Efforts to portray these individuals as participants in a "Zionist spy ring" are ludicrous. They are innocent and should be released immediately.

Since the beginning of the Islamic revolution, the government has claimed that it respects Jews and the Jewish community. Indeed 25,000 Jews still live in Iran. But this has been a difficult 20 years for the Jewish community in Iran. The government has consistently articulated anti-Israel and anti-Zionist propaganda. A number of Jews have been executed on charges of spying. Jewish property has been confiscated, and there are other reports of other discrimination.

Still, the Iranian government has consistently asserted that it is not anti-Jewish and that the Jewish community is an integral part of Iranian society and plays a legitimate religious and social role. And the worst fears about excesses by the Islamic regime against the Jewish community have generally not come to pass.

However, by charging these innocent members of the Jewish community, the regime seems to be going beyond anything previously witnessed, reactivating some of those long-held fears.

I urge the President to make a strong statement demanding the release of the Iran thirteen. I believe it is imperative that Iran immediately release these innocent individuals and to stop its anti-Semitic behavior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### VOTE NO ON PNTR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed a very fine debate on PNTR, and I thought that I

would expand for my 5 minutes' worth a little bit on the points that have been made today.

I think it was vital that people not miss the point that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) stressed when he gave his speech, and that was that many of the companies that we are talking about that have been opened up and that people are talking about doing business with in Communist China are companies that are owned by the People's Liberation Army.

What a travesty it is that what we have got, and this is as I have repeated in that debate several times, the essence of what is being decided is whether or not major businessmen in the United States can invest in building manufacturing facilities in Communist China, while what they do when they build these manufacturing capabilities in China, these manufacturing centers, they have to go into business, they have to go into business with a Chinese partner. Who is that Chinese partner? More often than not, the Chinese partner is the People's Liberation Army.

Thus we are providing the capital through the American taxpayer, subsidizing the loans that these businessmen get, guaranteeing the loans so that people will give them the loans they need to create these manufacturing jobs, manufacturing centers in Communist China. They go over there and set them up and who is their business partner? Who is splitting the profit with them? The People's Liberation Army.

The People's Liberation Army that builds missiles with the technology that they steal from us and the technology that they get from us through this economic relationship they have with our businessmen, and they build these missiles. Who are those missiles aimed at? Today because of our policies toward Communist China, the Communist Chinese regime has the capability of killing tens of millions of Americans, and they did not have that capability 10 years ago.

This is not the type of policy that we should make permanent. It has worked against the American people. Why should the American people subsidize a businessman for closing a company here and setting it up in China? We are told over and over again the debate is about selling American products overseas.

Please listen to that debate when you hear that. It is not about selling American products. Almost none of our economic activity with Communist China is the selling of American products. What we are sending over there are manufacturing units. What we are selling to China is the ability to manufacture high technology goods.

We heard it today in the home district of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE). Motorola has set up a chip manufacturing company there. Why should the people in his district not be in those jobs, building those chips, in Illinois or in other places?